


REMARKS

This amendment addresses the official Action of November 29, 2004 and the reference cited therein. The claims remaining in the case are 1- 28.

Claims 15-26 have been herein amended to exclude the methylpyrrole group as suggested by the examiner and remain in the case.

Claims 1, 3-14 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to distinctly claim the invention. Specifically, the examiner states that the attempt to exclude methypyrrole as a linking group failed because the structure did not contain a hydrogen atom. Claims 1, 15 and 28 have been amend to include the correct methylpyrrole structure. No new matter has been added as one of ordinary skilled in the art would readily recognize that a hydrogen atom is attached to the nitrogen on the methylpyrrole. Claims 4, 5, 8, 17, 18, and 21 are rejected because a hydrogen atom is missing from the pyrrole nitrogen in several cases. Amendments have been made to these claims to include the hydrogen atom where necessary. No new matter has been added. Claims 4-6, and 8-13 are rejected because the term "moiety" lacked antecedent basis. These claims have been further amended to delete the reference to "moiety". Claim 28 was rejected because the compound of formula I was not defined. By this amendment claim 28 has been amended to define formula I in accordance with the specification. Claims 1and 28 are further rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Laurin (Bioorg Med. Chem. Lett. 9, 2079, 1999). The examiner states that Laurin discloses a compound wherein "X" is a methylpyrrole and that in the previous response applicants did not properly exclude methylpyrrole . Claims 1 and 28 have been amended to include a hydrogen atom at the nitrogen and to recite that when "X" is a




substituted heteroaryl it is not H_3C in accordance with the examiner's suggestion.

As a result of these amendments, the 112 and 102 rejections have been overcome. The upper and lower range of the definition of "X" is clear and the skilled artisan would not expect the claimed invention upon review of the cited reference.

Applicants now believe the Examiner's concerns have been met and overcome and respectfully request that the objections and rejections to claims be removed.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Sylvia A. Ayler
Reg. No. 36,436
Attorney for Applicant(s)
MERCK & CO., INC.
P.O. Box 2000
Rahway, New Jersey 07065-0907
(732) 594-4909

Date: January 26, 2005